

☐ UNCLASSIFIED ☐ INTERNAL ☐ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Chairman, Language Development
Committee

EXTENSION

NO.

DTR-4861

DATE

17 APR 1970

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and
building)

819 Globe

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom
to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Deputy Director for
Support 7D-18 Hq.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

DDTS DEPTISTRY
FILE *Hanning 3*

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

DTR-4861

DD/S

70-1592


17 APR 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

SUBJECT : Language Development Program

REFERENCE : Memo dtd 16 Feb 1970, to DCI
frm Chm, LDC, same subject --
Annual Report

In the reference a supplemental report was promised
for 15 April. As the Language Register necessary to prepare
this report was not received from Computer Services until
13 April, I regret to say that a proper analysis of the
material will now take until approximately 15 May.


Chairman,
Language Development Committee

25X1

cc: ✓ DD/S
DTR


~~SECRET~~

FILE

DD/S 70-1317

1 APR 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: John Coffey

SUBJECT : Language Training School Development
Committee Report


1. Reference is made to the 13 March 1970 review of the Language Development Report and attached papers. I have discussed this report with the Executive Director as to course of action to be taken in light of this report. Mr. [redacted] is to submit around April 15 a more detailed report of the Language Training Program with cost statistics, etc. This report was requested by the Executive Director. Mr. [redacted] advises informally that his more detailed findings indicate the costs and other factors are not quite as bad as originally thought to be the case. Apparently the report will not be as grave in its implications as first intimated. The procedure will be that upon receipt of the [redacted] Report this will be reviewed and then submitted to the members of the Deputies' Meeting for consideration. At some meeting following 15 April this will be considered by the Deputies. If they concur that action should be taken I will then propose to constitute a committee chaired by a DD/S representative and composed of representatives from the other Directorates and the Director's staff for a full review of the Language Training Program and for any recommendations this group deems appropriate. The findings of the report will presumably be considered at a subsequent Deputies' Meeting.

2. I advised the Executive Director that in attempting to relocate the Language Training School from Arlington Towers five bids have been

~~SECRET~~downgrading and
declassification

SECRET

received by GSA in response to their advertisement. These are under consideration by GSA at the present time and I have asked the Director of Logistics to work closely with the GSA in the review of these bids and with a view to expediting consideration of these proposals. I see no reason to hold up the relocation of the Language Training School pending this survey. As both the Executive Director and the DD/S viewed the problem we must have our own language training capability to serve the Agency needs. A study will certainly result in recommendations which might qualify certain aspects of the program but it is not considered that we would eliminate our program entirely. I think the security factors as well as the tradecraft specialties which have been reviewed and discussed many times and have been judged many times before will necessitate continuation of our Language Training Program.


R. L. Bannerman
Deputy Director
for Support

25X1

SECRET

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

SECRET

DD/S 70-1045

13 MAR 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Directorate Position on Language Training School -
Language Development Committee Report

1. The 16 February 1970 report of the Language Development Committee contains a recommendation (page 5) that "the premise on which our (Language) School was established should be reviewed with the aim of determining the need and wisdom of its continued operation." As this suggestion was not explored in depth, you requested that we review the report and develop a Directorate position.

2. Discussion:

a. Costs: The subject report states that the Language Training School costs approximately \$1 million annually and is currently training fewer than 500 persons. In CY 1969 these 500 students logged approximately 100,000 hours of training which results in a cost of approximately \$10 per hour. In contrast, according to the report, a 44-week course at the Foreign Service Institute costs the Agency about \$3 per hour. The report also speculates that training contracts with the Defense Language Institute could result in an hourly rate even lower than FSI. Commercial schools, such as Berlitz and Sanz, charge from \$7 to \$9 an hour. While the above cost estimates should not be regarded as definitive, they raise a serious question concerning the cost effectiveness of the Language Training School.

b. Cover Factors: The Language Development Committee report also touches on the relationship of cover to language training and suggests



25X1

SECRET

SECRET

c. "Essential" Language Training: The Agency has identified

[redacted] of all professional positions as "language essential".

The supplemental report due 15 April 1970 will identify the number of Agency officers whose qualifications in various languages have been certified. Further analysis is required to describe the relationship of the Language Training School to the Agency's language requirements and the language skills of Agency employees. Whether the Agency takes a "hard line" geared to identified requirements or a more relaxed position toward language training and maintenance of language proficiency may be a critical factor as to the appropriate function of the Language Training School.

3. Issues:

The above discussion is sketchy, but it poses a number of issues concerning the Language Training School.

Is a separate CIA language training facility truly a necessity?

If so, how large should it be in terms of its role in the over-all Agency Language Training Program?

Or is the Language Training School largely a convenience when considered in the context of customer demand versus Agency requirements?

How do cover considerations bear on external versus internal language training?

What reliance could be placed on exclusive use of external facilities, recognizing that an on-going program of the scope of the present Language Training School requires time to develop?

What is the over-all assessment of how well the Language Training School performs its function?

4. Conclusion:


The material presented in the report of the Language Development Committee has not been sufficiently developed to warrant any firm Directorate position concerning the future of the Language Training School. However, the recommendation presented by this senior, knowledgeable group of Agency officers is spotlighted by enough basic data as to warrant further serious consideration.

SECRET

SECRET

Accordingly, it is recommended that you initiate an in-depth study of the Language Development Committee recommendation concerning the Language Training School. Other Directorates probably should be represented in the study group and possibly O/PPB as well. The Chairman should be selected by, and report to you. Terms of reference for such a study group should be submitted for your approval. You may wish to have a study group consider the following range of alternatives:

1. Continue the Language Training School as is.
2. Cut back the School to some truly "essential" level.
3. Abolish the School and rely completely on external training.
4. Convert or replace much or all of School with a proprietary mechanism.



Support Operations Staff/DDS

25X1

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS			DATE	INITIALS
1	DD/S				
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks:					
<p>I think you will be interested in the attached annual report from the Chairman, Language Development Committee. Your representative on the Committee has all of the detailed statistical reports, and I would urge that you discuss them with him before too long.</p> <p>After I receive the supplemental report from the Committee on or about <u>15 April</u>, I shall place this item on the agenda for one of our Deputies Meetings.</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Executive Director-Comptroller				2 Mar 70	

STAT

DR-4575

3/8 70-0817

Executive Registry
70-817

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Language Development Program -
Annual Report

1. Conclusions

a. It is now likely that the structure necessary to implement the Language Development Program (LDP) will be functioning by the 1 January 1971 deadline. The Program's dimensions will be modest. Thirteen per cent (13%) of all professional and 28.47% of CS positions have been designated as requiring a language proficiency.

b. One hour in the Language Training School in internal training is more expensive than one hour in most external training programs. The cost of internal training alone is over \$1,000,000 annually. The premises on which the School is based should be re-examined.

c. The cost of merely maintaining the present level of language competence is high and resistance to investing months, even years, in study is great. Without careful and regular review and top-management's support and encouragement we cannot expect to improve upon our present capability.

d. The campaign to raise the Agency language capability resulted in more individual student time in training; two new programs, (1) out-of-hours for all Agency personnel and (2) maintenance courses for CS personnel; an increase in external training and an important full-time program for young CS officers abroad. A total of employees received language training in CY 1969.

e. The professional competence of the Language School generally and the quality of instruction particularly improved during CY 1969. We must accentuate efforts to move the School into acceptable quarters--those we now inhabit are untenable.

25X9

25X9

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

3. Plans

A supplemental report will be forwarded by 15 April to show (1) the tested competence by language skill and proficiency, (2) a comparison of the tested inventory and position requirements and (3) the number of those with language competence who are over fifty. Unfortunately a machine run received for this report did not contain the information we expected.

4. Recommendations

a. As Chairman of the Agency's Language Development Committee, I recommend that the testing "books" of the LDP be closed as of 30 June 1970 and that all those in the Headquarters area who have not been tested, or made arrangements to resolve their claims, be removed from current language machine runs. While this may seem to be a drastic recommendation, all serious individuals have had four years in which to resolve their claims. Employees in this category can get back "into the record" simply by being tested. Further, it is time the Agency have and work from an ADP run of tested claims and not from old and questionable claims.

b. Now that the LDP is about to go into full operation, this is a good time to look into the future. It is at present costing \$1,000,000 annually to maintain our internal language capability to train fewer than [] persons. In CY 1969, these [] logged approximately 100,000 hours of training. A conservative estimate of the per hour cost of internal language training, comes out more expensive than any external language training. A 44-week course at FSI costs us about \$3.00 an hour. FSI classes are larger, as is the population from which FSI draws its students, which allows them to get more for their dollar and maximum use of their faculty--whereas some of our instructors are often without students and more often than not, classes are only partially filled. We run many classes for one and two students. Experience tells us we cannot realistically expect to regularize enrollments, to force an economical class level, nor can we expect to maintain a quality faculty on a WAE basis. Training contracts with the Defense Language Institute could perhaps result in something even cheaper than FSI costs. Berlitz, Sanz, and other such schools charge from \$7.00 to \$9.00 an hour.

c. If there are to be further cuts in our official representation abroad and a greater concentration on deep cover, the nature of our language training should not violate tradecraft principles concerned. In other words those

25X1



This would leave only overt employees to use our school. In view of these reasons I recommend that the premises on which our school was established be reviewed with the aim of determining the need and wisdom of its continued operation.



25X1

Chairman, Language Development Committee

Atts

Forwarded with this report are the following seventeen (17) statistical Tables for CY 1969.

- # 1 Summary of Internal Training by language and number of students and terminations. *
- # 2 External Training by languages and by components.
- # 3 Number of Proficiency Tests given by yearly quarters.
- # 3-A The "Other" (untested claims, retests after 5 years and tests of overseas returnees) category of proficiency by Directorate.
- # 4 Summary of Internal Training by the CS showing number of students and languages.
- # 4-A Breakdown of CS Training showing components, languages studied, numbers and completions.
- # 5 Idem # 4 for DDI.
- # 5-A Idem # 4-A for DDI.
- # 6 Idem # 4 for DDS.
- # 6-A Idem # 4-A for DDS.
- # 7 Idem # 4 for DDS&T.
- # 7-A Idem # 4-A for DDS&T.
- # 8 Involvement in Internal Training by Directorates.
- # 9 Special Training (mainly English as a foreign language)
- # 10-A, 10-B, 10-C: DDI, DDP, DDS - Language Position Requirements.

* This means the student was enrolled and departed the School. It does not relate to finishing a course of study or attainment of a new level of proficiency.

SECRET

10-00000

NOTE FOR: Mr. Coffey

1. Per our conversation, attached is report on the Language Development Program. The original went directly to the Executive Director.


25X1

2. Included in the covering memorandum are two recommendations, one of which Rod mentioned at the DD/S Staff Meeting on 17 February. These are:

a. "Close" the testing books as of 30 June 1970.

b. Review the need for a separate Agency Language School in view of its limited use and high costs.

3. Mr. Bannerman might wish to have these recommendations discussed at a Deputies' Meeting.



25X1

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DD/S 7C-0696

FROM:

Chairman, Language Development Committee
819 Glebe

EXTENSION

NO.

DTR-4575

DATE

16 February 1970

25X1

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Deputy Director for
Support 7D-26 Hq.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

3 11 1969 10700

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Language Development Program -
Annual Report

1. Conclusions

a. It is now likely that the structure necessary to implement the Language Development Program (LDP) will be functioning by the 1 January 1971 deadline. The Program's dimensions will be modest. Thirteen per cent (13%) of all professional and 28.47% of CS positions have been designated as requiring a language proficiency.

b. One hour in the Language Training School in internal training is more expensive than one hour in most external training programs. The cost of internal training alone is over \$1,000,000 annually. The premises on which the School is based should be re-examined.

c. The cost of merely maintaining the present level of language competence is high and resistance to investing months, even years, in study is great. Without careful and regular review and top-management's support and encouragement we cannot expect to improve upon our present capability.

d. The campaign to raise the Agency language capability resulted in more individual student time in training; two new programs, (1) out-of-hours for all Agency personnel and (2) maintenance courses for CS personnel; an increase in external training and an important full-time program for young CS officers abroad. A total of employees received language training in CY 1969.

e. The professional competence of the Language School generally and the quality of instruction particularly improved during CY 1969. We must accentuate efforts to move the School into acceptable quarters--those we now inhabit are untenable.

25X9

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

3. Plans

A supplemental report will be forwarded by 15 April to show (1) the tested competence by language skill and proficiency, (2) a comparison of the tested inventory and position requirements and (3) the number of those with language competence who are over fifty. Unfortunately a machine run received for this report did not contain the information we expected.

4. Recommendations

a. As Chairman of the Agency's Language Development Committee, I recommend that the testing "books" of the LDP be closed as of 30 June 1970 and that all those in the Headquarters area who have not been tested, or made arrangements to resolve their claims, be removed from current language machine runs. While this may seem to be a drastic recommendation, all serious individuals have had four years in which to resolve their claims. Employees in this category can get back "into the record" simply by being tested. Further, it is time the Agency have and work from an ADP run of tested claims and not from old and questionable claims.

b. Now that the LDP is about to go into full operation, this is a good time to look into the future. It is at present costing \$1,000,000 annually to maintain our internal language capability to train fewer than persons. In CY 1969, these logged approximately 100,000 hours of training. A conservative estimate of the per hour cost of internal language training, comes out more expensive than any external language training. A 44-week course at FSI costs us about \$3.00 an hour. FSI classes are larger, as is the population from which FSI draws its students, which allows them to get more for their dollar and maximum use of their faculty--whereas some of our instructors are often without students and more often than not, classes are only partially filled. We run many classes for one and two students. Experience tells us we cannot realistically expect to regularize enrollments, to force an economical class level, nor can we expect to maintain a quality faculty on a WAE basis. Training contracts with the Defense Language Institute could perhaps result in something even cheaper than FSI costs. Berlitz, Sanz, and other such schools charge from \$7.00 to \$9.00 an hour.

c. If there are to be further cuts in our official representation abroad and a greater concentration on deep cover, the nature of our language training should not violate tradecraft principles concerned. In other words those

25X1



This would leave only overt employees to use our school. In view of these reasons I recommend that the premises on which our school was established be reviewed with the aim of determining the need and wisdom of its continued operation.



25X1

Chairman, Language Development Committee

Atts

Distribution:

Orig - adse

1 - ER

1 - Ex Dir-Compt

2 - DTR

Forwarded with this report are the following seventeen (17) statistical Tables for CY 1969.

- # 1 Summary of Internal Training by language and number of students and terminations. *
- # 2 External Training by languages and by components.
- # 3 Number of Proficiency Tests given by yearly quarters.
- # 3-A The "Other" (untested claims, retests after 5 years and tests of overseas returnees) category of proficiency by Directorate.
- # 4 Summary of Internal Training by the CS showing number of students and languages.
- # 4-A Breakdown of CS Training showing components, languages studied, numbers and completions.
- # 5 Idem # 4 for DDI.
- # 5-A Idem # 4-A for DDI.
- # 6 Idem # 4 for DDS.
- # 6-A Idem # 4-A for DDS.
- # 7 Idem # 4 for DDS&T.
- # 7-A Idem # 4-A for DDS&T.
- # 8 Involvement in Internal Training by Directorates.
- # 9 Special Training (mainly English as a foreign language)
- # 10-A, 10-B, 10-C: DDI, DDP, DDS - Language Position Requirements.

* This means the student was enrolled and departed the School. It does not relate to finishing a course of study or attainment of a new level of proficiency.

25X9

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7

Next 17 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700100015-7